



claims 58 and 78 patentably distinguish over Tachibana for the reasons given above in this paragraph.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 45, 49-52, 55, 57, 61, 62, 66, 69-72, 75-77, 80-82 and 85 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 23, 24, 25, 28 and 37 of U. S. Patent No. 6,458,109. A terminal disclaimer is submitted herewith in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c) to overcome the double patenting rejection.

New Claim

New claim 86 is believed to be allowable because none of the cited art teach or fairly suggest the limitations of new claim - *namely*, "first and second fluid drainage receptacles coupled to the drainage tube; and first and second valves coupled between the fluid drainage tube and the first and second fluid drainage receptacles, respectively."

Further Action

In view of the foregoing amendment and supporting remarks, the subject application is now deemed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview would expedite the allowance of this application, he is requested to contact the undersigned for a prompt resolution of any outstanding issues.

It is respectfully requested, if necessary to effect a timely response, that this paper be considered as a Petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response and shortages and other fees be charged, or any overpayment in fees be credited, to

RECEIVED
JAN 15 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700